



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DISPUTED PHRASINGS IN THE SIDDUR

BY A. MISHCON, London.

THE line of demarcation which Judaism so persistently preserves between the human and the divine is brought into outstanding relief by a comparison of the Prayer Book with the Bible. In point of antiquity the two are placed by tradition practically on a par. The foundation and framework of the Siddur are attributed to the Patriarchs. Its main structure is said to have been raised by some of the prophets.¹ So that the liturgy may well claim some of the biblical writers as its authors. Yet the very tradition which advances that claim has not allowed the Siddur to be placed on a level with any part of the Torah. The position it holds in the Jew's affection may indeed be second to none; it has rightly been pointed out that the Siddur is as a rule never absent even from those homes where you would look in vain for a Bible. Why then has it been denied the authority, the sanctity of the sacred writings?

The answer is not far to seek. The Torah contains the divine word, or the product of the human mind under divine inspiration. The Siddur is the record of *Israel's* meditations. It is purely human; and Israel's genius which

אברהם תקן תפלה שחרית . . . יצחק תקן תפלה מנחה . . . יעקב תקן¹
תפלה מעריב (Ber. 26b).

אנשי כנסת הגדולה תקנו להם לישראל ברכות ותפלות (Ibid. 33 a)
מאה ועשרים זקנים ובהם כמה נביאים תקנו שמנה עשרה ברכות על הסדר
(Meg. 17 b).

will ever regard as three-fourths of its mission to maintain a boundary line between the human and the divine, has advisedly kept it beneath this line.

In some respects this inferior position has proved rather advantageous to the Siddur; it has placed it beyond that fixed finality which is the natural characteristic of the divine. The Bible was definitely closed with the inclusion of its last book; the committing of the Talmud to writing has meant the arrest of its growth; but the Prayer Book after close upon two and a half millenniums of continuous cultivation still remains an open book. To this day its binding is, so to say, flexible enough to admit an unlimited number of fresh leaves. But the loose-leaf method of binding has its failings as well as its facilities. It freely accommodates new sheets, but it is not proof against tampering with those it already contains. The Prayer Book partook of the facilities, but it also suffered the disadvantages. It has retained its developing capacity, but only at the cost of its uniformity. Not only have divergent minhagim parted off from the main stream, the original Temple service, but variations crept into each minhag. And whereas in the case of Holy Writ the slightest discrepancy was promptly adjusted,² no such zeal was displayed in the case of the less sacred liturgy. The prayer עלינו and the Book of Joshua are both ascribed by tradition to Moses' successor. Yet, while the retention of the slightest textual variation between two editions of the biblical book would be simply unthinkable, the liturgical piece ascribed to the same author does

² Not only was a standard copy of the Pentateuch kept in the 'Azarah for purposes of rectification, but expert revisers were employed, at public cost, to whom any individual could bring his copy of Scripture for correction without direct payment.

contain a number of divergencies which have to this day remained unrectified.³

Nor are these variations confined to textual *readings*. They also affect that part of the text with which this article is chiefly concerned—the phrasing. The latter, in fact, has suffered the more. For it remained uninfluenced by those unifying forces which did make for textual uniformity. There was the mystic. Advisedly or otherwise, he was a great unifying factor. By fixing the number of words which comprised the various prayers, and placing each within the safe custody of a 'בִּנְיָן', he has undoubtedly helped to standardize many a liturgical text. But only as far as the wording in its strictest sense is concerned. The grouping of the words into phrases was beyond his scope or object. Vocalization, too, was naturally conducive to textual correctness. But many of those who set themselves the task of supplying the liturgical texts with vowels left the phrasing of the words to take care of itself. Even in manuscripts which are vocalized the divisions of chapters only are as a rule marked, and these too only by spaces, while the sentences run on in close succession without any break.

When later compilers found it necessary to set the phrases of the Siddur within bounds, it was not always easy for them to trace the boundary lines. Nor did they always trouble about tracing them. Phrasing in the Torah must perforce be governed by the rigid rule כָּל פְּסוּקָא דְלֹא פְסָקִיָּה מֹשֶׁה אֵין לֹא פְסָקִין לֵיהּ. In the Siddur every compiler placed the dividing double-points and the sub-dividing single ones

³ Sephardi, which almost accords with Vitry, has, for example, וְנֹאמַר . . . אֲחֵרִי . . . וְלֹא פְסָקִין בְּתוֹרָה; הוא אֲלֵהֵינוּ וְאֵין עוֹד אֲחֵרִי . . . וְנֹאמַר; while וְנֹאמַר is missing, and כּוֹרְעִים is bracketed.

according to his own sweet will. And a mere cursory glance will suffice to prove how indiscriminately these are used. The few critical editors of the Siddur were more cautious, but they were not always able to decide in whose favour to give the casting vote when opinions are equally divided.

In this article some typical examples are collected and discussed; they are grouped, in some cases, according to the features they present in common, rather than the order in which they occur in the Prayer Book.

I.

The Disputed Phrasings of the Shema' (Singer's edition of the Prayer Book, p. 40), the earliest part of our liturgy, may well be taken as our first example.

While the first of the phrasings given here is the one generally accepted, the second is said to have been adopted by the Jews of Jericho (Pesahim 56 a), thus :

(a) והיו הדברים האלה אשר אנכי מצוך היום | על לבבך

(b) והיו הדברים האלה אשר אנכי מצוך | היום על לבבך

(a) And these words which I command thee this day, shall be upon thy heart.

(b) And these words which I command thee, shall this day be upon thy heart.

The deviation from the general practice may have resulted from the fact that the 'men of Jericho' recited the *Shema'* in the manner of כריכה (?) instead of פריסה.⁴ The matter, however, has no practical bearing, as both this mode of reciting and the phrasing which is supposed to have resulted therefrom have long passed into disuse.

⁴ For the precise meaning of these terms see Elbogen's *Der Jüdische Gottesdienst*, 25 sq., and notes, p. 515.

2.

Three different phrasings are mentioned in the Talmud (Berakot 14 a seq.) for the words which form the junction between the Shema' and the prayer immediately following it (Singer, 42):

- (a) אני ה' אלהיכם | אמת ויציב . . .
 (b) אני ה' אלהיכם אמת | אמת ויציב . . .
 (c) אני ה' אלהיכם אמת | ויציב . . .

This dispute has its origin in the opinion expressed by R. Judah (*cir.* 150) that no interruption of any kind is permissible between the concluding section of the Shema' and 'the blessing which follows it', so that the two liturgical pieces should be inseparably linked together.⁵ בין ויאמר לאמת ויציב לא יפסיק (Mishnah Ber. 2, 1). Somehow, in the discussion of the Tanna's opinion, his words are cited so as to convey the idea that the *concluding word* of the last section of the Shema' should be closely followed by the opening word of the next prayer; in other words, that the אמת should adjoin the אלהיכם, so as to conform to the biblical phrase of Jer. 10. 10—לא יפסיק בין אלהיכם לאמת ויציב (Ber. 14 a; Jer. Ber. 2, 5).⁶

The Talmud accepts R. Judah's opinion as the general law, to be followed whenever the Shema' is recited, and even records the fact that in those places in Palestine where

⁵ The object of joining these two prayers so closely is, no doubt, to prevent 'the prayer following the Shema'' being regarded as unessential and consequently being dispensed with. A similar precautionary measure, which was also applied to the Evening Service, is the passage: כל שלא אמר אמת ויציב שחרית אמת ואמונה ערבית לא יצא ידי חובתו סמיכת גאולה לתפלה. The immense importance attached by the Rabbis to fastening a supplementary part of the service to the main body.

⁶ See נכסף משנה to Maimonides, Hil. Ker. Shema' 2, 1.

the third section of the Evening Shema' was dispensed with (since *לילה לאו זמן ציצית*) and substituted by a brief epitome of it, consisting of its opening and closing words, these closing words were supplemented by *אמת* so that it be not separated from *אלהיכם*.⁷

In deference to this Rabbi's opinion as interpreted in the Gemara, phrasing (*a*), however commendable it may have appeared, had to be abandoned. The dispute now lay between (*b*) and (*c*), the point in question being whether *אמת* should be doubled, the one to be joined to *אלהיכם*, and the other to join *ויציב* as required by the context. The decision was against a repetition. It is even recorded that Rabba (*cir.* 300), on hearing a ש"ץ pronounce *אמת* twice, administered him a mild censure in the witty remark: 'This man is suffering from an excess of "truth".'

The decision was therefore given in favour of (*c*). But the matter was not allowed to rest there. The word-counting mystics discovered that the words of the Shema' (including *ברוך שם כבוד מלכותו לעולם ועד*) very nearly amounted to the favoured number 248, which is the reputed total of both the affirmative commandments of the Torah and the members of the human body. Three more words were needed to make the total complete. For that purpose *אל מלך נאמן* was added to the beginning.⁸ The words may have been readily supplied, even suggested, by the 'Amen'

⁷ אמרי במערבא ערבית, דבר אל בני ישראל ואמרת אליהם אני ה' אלהיכם (Ber. 14 b).

⁸ Amram has no mention of the ר"מ'ח device; while Vitry arrives at this number by adding *אל מלך נאמן* in *תפלת צבור*, which we now do only in the case of *יחיד*. See Elbogen, *op. cit.*, 21; his assertion that *אל מלך נאמן* and *אל אמת* ה' were both used simultaneously, the one by the congregation and the other by the Ḥazan, does not seem to be well founded. See also Weiss, *Dor*, IV, 111.

(אל מלך נאמן = א'מ'ן) which was there as the response after the preceding Benediction. Sephardi authorities were averse to this practice on account of the objectionable interception it formed between the Benediction and the Shema'. They therefore supplemented the three, at the other end, by repeating א'ני ה' אלהיכם.

Subsequently, on reputed zoharic authority, and evidently with a view to the double object, of completing the desired total and linking of אלהיכם to אמת, the three words to be repeated at the end by the Ḥazan were אמת אלהיכם אמת.

This was by no means allowed to go unopposed. Rashba, R. Simeon Duran, and some of his distinguished kinsmen strongly deprecated the annexation of the non-biblical word אמת. Rashal shared this view. 'When I act as Ḥazan on the occasion of my father's *jahrzeit*—he states in a responsum—I make a point of repeating aloud א'ני ה' אלהיכם'⁹

But the French school prevailed. Phrasing (c) with the repetition of אמת אלהיכם אמת is now the universally accepted practice.¹⁰

3.

The decision quoted above against repeating אמת, as well as the talmudic objection to the doubling of the word שמע, led Ibn Jarḥi to object to the repetition of אחר in the Sabbath Musaph Ḳedushah (Singer, 160-161). Isaac Luria (כתבי האר"י) who is followed by many others, particularly

⁹ See תשבץ, ii. 236; יכין ובוטו, ii. 2; חתם סופר, Or. Ḥayim 10; חש' רש"י, 64.

¹⁰ The practice, however, obviously defeats its own object, for 'Shema' to 'Emet' inclusive, *plus* the additional three words, total 249 instead of 248; see on this point מנ' א' to Or. Ḥayim 61, also Emden's Siddur, *ad loc.*

by Minhag Poland, for the same reason denounces the phrasing :

(a) . . . ה' אחד | אחד הוא אלהינו

and insists on :

(b) . . . ה' אחד | הוא אלהינו

The commentary *השקל מחצית* to Orah Haim, 286, however, advocates (a), pointing out that this is not a case of repetition since the second אחד opens a new paragraph. We can go further and say that this אחד is essential, being the catchword for the poetical embellishment of the phrase which concludes with it, in the same way as the final words of the other biblical *kedushah* phrases—כבודו and ממקומו—serve for the other elaborations.

4.

In the first Benediction preceding the Shema the prayer תתברך (Singer, 38) apparently opens with a parallelism :

(a) תתברך צורנו מלכנו וגואלנו בורא קדושים |
ישתבח שמך לעד מלכנו יוצר משרתים |

‘Be thou blessed, O our Rock, our King and Redeemer,
Creator of holy beings;
Praised be thy name for ever, O our King,
Creator of ministering spirits;’

which is however missed in *our* phrasing :

(b) תתברך צורנו מלכנו וגואלנו | בורא קדושים ישתבח שמך לעד
מלכנו | יוצר משרתים . . .

‘Be thou blessed, O our Rock, our King and Redeemer,
Creator of holy beings, praised be thy name for ever, O our
King; Creator of ministering spirits . . .’

The *סדור כל בו* has actually the former punctuation !

5.

But in any case it is erroneous to punctuate the phrase immediately following :

(a) יוצר משרתים ואשר משרתי | כלם עומדים . . .

instead of

(b) יוצר משרתים | ואשר משרתי כלם עומדים . . .

This misphrasing is fairly old, for the traditional tune to which these words are chanted by Ḥazanīm is divided according to (a) and must have been jarring upon the ears of countless worshippers for many a decade. Cantor A. Baer in his *Baal T'fillah* even places a crochet rest after משרתי both in the Week-day, Sabbath, and Festival Services (pp. 9, 124, 228).

Ḥazanīm could best avoid this error by commencing their chanting with כלם אהובים.

6.

Singer's device to avoid a misphrasing which has been similarly perpetuated by the tune to which it is set, has not been made quite clear by him; hence it is generally disregarded. I am alluding to the seventh verse of יגדל (p. 3) which Singer, deviating from all other Sidurim, phrases

(a) לא קם בישראל כמשה עוד נביא | ומביט את תמונתו :

in preference to

(b) לא קם בישראל כמשה עוד | נביא ומביט את תמונתו :

His intention undoubtedly was not so much to join the word נביא to the foregoing, as to separate it from the following word, since phrasing (b), *coupled with the English traditional melody*, gives the imperfect setting of

(c) לא קם בישראל כמשה עוד | נביא ומביט | את תמונתו :

What, evidently, Singer rightly desired is :

(d) לא קם בישראל כמשה עוד | נביא | ומביט את תמונתו :

7.

Lower in the same hymn the phrase

נומל לאיש | חסד במפעלו (a)

is punctuated by some

נומל לאיש חסד | במפעלו

which makes איש a construct of חסד. But here we may best be guided by the parallelism, which points unmistakably to (a), thus:

נומל לאיש | חסד במפעלו

נותן לרשע | רע כרשעתו

8.

The variant phrasings in the paragraph next following of the Shema' Benedictions depend on the vocalization of the word קדשה. If it be קְדוּשָׁה the phrasing must be

(a) בשפה ברורה ובנעימה קדושה | כלם כאחד עונים

'With pure speech and holy melody they all respond in unison' (Singer, 39).

If קְדוּשָׁה then:

(b) בשפה ברורה ובנעימה | קדשה כלם כאחד עונים

'With pure speech and with melody they all respond the "sanctification" in unison.'

The first reading seems by far preferable. Not only does it make for syntactical correctness—the sentence is distorted according to (b)—but authoritative evidence is overwhelmingly on its side. Amram, presumably also Vitry, Abudraham, and Abarbanel all have קְדוּשָׁה; Abudraham mentions the other reading only to denounce it as incorrect. These are followed by Baer (68) (who also cites other authorities), Sachs, Singer, and others. Yet those who read קְדוּשָׁה, among whom is Landshuth (43), may claim the support of Tosaphot Hagigah 13 b, s. v. מויעתן.

Whichever of the two alternatives one may choose, he should be on his guard against coupling the reading of the one with the phrasing of the other, a pitfall which is not escaped by many a Ḥazan.

9.

On all fours with this is an instance from מִנְּאֲבוֹת (Singer, 120).

Elsewhere, in an article devoted to this prayer, I suggested the reading of מַעַן הַבְּרִכוֹת instead of מַעַן הַבְּרִכוֹת.¹¹ The altered reading, which is actually contained in old liturgies in that prayer and has since been found in שִׁים שְׁלוֹם which the phrase in מִנְּאֲבוֹת epitomized, would naturally change the phrasing from :

(a) וְנוֹדָה לְשִׁמוּ בְּכָל יוֹם תָּמִיד מַעַן הַבְּרִכוֹת | אֱלֹהֵינוּ

‘And daily and constantly we will give thanks unto him in the fitting form of blessings. The God to whom thanksgivings are due. . . .’

to

(b) וְנוֹדָה לְשִׁמוּ בְּכָל יוֹם תָּמִיד | מַעַן הַבְּרִכוֹת אֱלֹהֵינוּ

‘And daily and constantly we will give thanks unto his name. He is the dwelling-place of blessings, the God to whom thanksgivings are due. . . .’

10.

The divergency in the phrasing in the second of the Blessings preceding the Shema¹ lies between the Ashkenazi and Sephardi minhagim. The former has :

¹¹ See ‘Study in Liturgy’, by A. Mishcon, in *Jewish Review*, London, 1910, I, 358 sq.; also Elbogen, p. 111, and note. The writer’s suggestion has been remarkably corroborated by the author of תּוֹרַת תְּמִימָה to Deut. 26. 15.

(a) ... ולא נבוש לעולם ועד | כי בשם קדשך הגדול והנורא במחנו
ננילה ונשמחה בישועתך.

'... so that we be never put to shame. Because we have trusted in thy great and revered name, we shall be glad and rejoice in thy salvation' (Singer, 40).

While in the latter it is:

(b) ... לא נבוש ... לעולם ועד כי בשם קדשך הגדול . . והנורא
במחנו | ננילה ונשמחה בישועתך.

'... that we be never . . . put to shame because we have trusted in thy great . . . and revered name. Let us be glad and rejoice in thy salvation. . . .'

So that the words *כי בשם* &c., while disconnected from the foregoing in (a), are closely connected with it according to (b). This point is further discussed under no. 15.

11.

In the Benediction following the Shema there does not seem to be room for a break in the phrase

(a) ועל כל דורות זרע ישראל עבדיך על הראשונים ועל האחרונים
which appears, indeed, undivided in Vitry, but which we divide between two paragraphs (Singer, 42):

(b) ועל כל דורות זרע ישראל עבדיך:
על הראשונים ועל האחרונים

The wording seems continuous—hence the Ḥazan's passing over this break in silence—for *על הראש' ועל האח'* is obviously the extension of *דורות*. The division here may have been occasioned by the branching off, at this point, of the two variants of *על הראשונים* which Minhag Poland uses respectively for ordinary occasions, and when ophan-piyut is said.

12.

This is also the case with

(a) לַמֶּלֶךְ אֵל חַי וְקַיִם | רַם וְנִשְׂא

which is divided by a double-point even by Landshuth and Baer, while Ḥagigah 13 a has the phrase

(b) מֶלֶךְ אֵל חַי וְקַיִם רַם וְנִשְׂא (שׁוֹכֵן עֲלֵיהֶם)

unbroken. Sachs has done well in omitting the dividing mark.

13.

Of the following two (Singer, 44) :

(a) שִׁירָה חֲדָשָׁה שִׁבְּחוּ גִּבּוֹרִים לְשִׁמְךָ עַל שְׁפַת הַיָּם | יַחַד כָּלָם . . .

(b) שִׁירָה חֲדָשָׁה שִׁבְּחוּ גִּבּוֹרִים לְשִׁמְךָ | עַל שְׁפַת הַיָּם יַחַד כָּלָם . . .

the former seems preferable.

14.

Which is also the case with

(a) גּוֹאֲלֵנוּ ה' צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ | קְרוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל

(b) גּוֹאֲלֵנוּ ה' צְבָאוֹת | שְׁמוֹ קְרוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל

15.

The Shemoneh Esreh has a parallel to the disputed phrasing of בְּמַחְנוּ—בְּנִיּוֹשׁ—mentioned above. The following passage in the thirteenth Benediction is variously phrased :

(a) וְתֵן שָׂכָר טוֹב לְכָל הַבּוֹטְחִים בְּשִׁמְךָ בְּאֵמֶת וְשִׁים חֲלָקְנוּ עִמָּהֶם

לְעוֹלָם | וְלֹא נִבּוֹשׁ כִּי בְךָ בְּמַחְנוּ

‘. . . grant a good reward unto all who faithfully trust in thy name ; set our portion with them for ever, so that we may not be put to shame ; for we have trusted in thee.’

(*ḥ*) ותן שכר טוב לכל הבוטחים בשמך באמת ושים חלקנו עמהם |
ולעולם לא נבוש כי כך בטחנו,¹²

‘. . . grant a good reward unto all who faithfully trust in thy name; set our portion with them; and may we never be put to shame, for we have trusted in thee.’

In both cases, it will be noted, *לא נבוש* and *בך בטחנו* go together, in accordance with the biblical phrase *בך בטחתי* (Ps. 25. 2), which proves that the Sephardi phrasing of the passage in *אהבה רבה* is the more correct one.

As regards the passage from the Amidah, Amram, and Vitry both have (*ḥ*), which is also preferred by Baer (95) and Berliner (*Randbem.*, I, 62) who cite the phrase *שלא נבוש* from Grace after Meals, in its support. It is somewhat strange that Singer (48) in face of all this evidence, chooses to connect the *ו* with *לא נבוש*—as in (*a*)—rather than with *לעולם*.

16.

By transferring the conjunctive *ו*, as in the foregoing example, a difficulty is removed in the fourth benediction of the Kiddush in the Marriage Service (Singer, 299). The reading, taken from Ketubbot 8 a, is

(*a*) אשר יצר את האדם בצלמו. בצלם דמות תבניתו. והתקין לו
ממנו בנין עדי עד.

As Berliner (*Randbem.*, II, 20) justly remarks, the term *תבנית* which seems here to refer to God is a gross anthropomorphism, even if used in a figurative sense, since it is only applicable to corporeal bodies. Saadya Gaon, however—as appears from a citation in ס'מ'ג', ed. 1488—by transferring the *ו* makes the words *בצלם דמות תבניתו* refer to Adam, thus: (*ḥ*) אשר יצר את האדם בצלמו. ובצלם דמות תבניתו התקין לו
ממנו בנין עדי עד.

¹² This is also the version given in Amram and Vitry.

17.

If in the preceding instances the variations are governed by the *transference* of the ו, it is the *omission* of this conjunction which has evidently affected the phrasing as well as the sense of the following passage in the 'long Tahanun'.

The fourth section of that meditation, in the Ashkenazi minhag, based on Vitry (69) begins:

(a) אָנָּא מֶלֶךְ חַנוּן וְרַחוּם. זְכוֹר וְהִבַּט לְבְרִית בֵּין הַבְּתָרִים | וְתִרְאֶה

לִפְנֵיךְ עֲקֵדַת יַחִיד לְמַעַן יִשְׂרָאֵל | אֲבִינוּ מִלְכֵנוּ חַנּוּן . . .

of which Singer (60) gives the following rendering, including the bracketing:

'We beseech thee, O gracious and merciful King, remember and give heed to the covenant between the pieces (with Abraham) and let the binding (upon the altar) of (Isaac) an only son appear before thee, to the welfare of Israel. Our Father, our King, be gracious unto us. . . .'

The question naturally suggests itself, Why is there no allusion to Jacob in connexion with the other Patriarchs? The answer is: The allusion is there. Only it is obscured by the altered phrasing. This is how the Sephardi minhag has it (Gaster, I, 42):

(b) אָנָּא מֶלֶךְ חַנוּן וְרַחוּם. זְכוֹר וְהִבַּט לְבְרִית בֵּין הַבְּתָרִים | וְתִרְאֶה

לִפְנֵיךְ עֲקֵדַת יַחִיד | וְלְמַעַן יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲבִינוּ¹³

'We beseech thee, O gracious and merciful King, remember and give heed to the covenant between the pieces (with Abraham) and let the binding (upon the altar) of (Isaac) an only son appear before thee, *and* for the sake of Israel (Jacob) our father, O our King, be gracious unto us . . .'

¹³ Amram's version, ed. Warsaw, bears a resemblance to both; it lacks the ו, and stops after אֲבִינוּ; thus: וְתִרְאֶה לִפְנֵיךְ עֲקֵדַת יַחִיד לְמַעַן יִשְׂרָאֵל: אֲבִינוּ.

18.

Other variations in the same paragraph are :

(a) כי אין לנו אלה אחר מבלעדיך צורנו | אל תעובנו . . .

‘For we have no other God beside thee, our Rock. Forsake us not . . .’ (Singer, 60),

which is the phrasing generally accepted. Yet M. Sachs (תפלה ישראל, 3rd edition, p. 86) has it :

(b) כי אין לנו אלה אחר מבלעדיך | צורנו אל תעובנו

‘Denn wir haben keinen Gott ausser Dir. Unser Hort, verlass uns nicht. . . .’

19.

So also further in the same paragraph :

General phrasing (Singer, 60) :

כי נפשנו קצרה מחרב ומשב ודבר וממנופה ומכל צרה ויגון | הצילנו
כי לך קוינו

‘For our soul is shrunken by reason of the sword and captivity and pestilence and plague, and of every trouble and sorrow. Deliver us, for we hope in thee . . .’

Sachs (ibid.):

כי נפשנו קצרה מחרב ומשב ודבר וממנופה | ומכל צרה ויגון הצילנו
כי לך קוינו

‘Denn unsere Seele ist gebeugt durch Schwert und Gefangenschaft und Pest und Seuche. O von aller Noth und jeglichem Kummer rette uns, denn auf Dich harren wir.’

20.

The opening phrase of a subsequent paragraph of the same supplication (Singer, 61),

(a) הפותח יד בתשובה | לקבל פושעים וחטאים

presents a generally felt difficulty, inasmuch as its first part, the words הפותח יד בתשובה, hardly makes any sense.

Commentators, as a rule, leave this phrase alone; and translators, who are denied this very present refuge, usually resort for safety to paraphrasing. Thus Sachs's rendering runs: 'Der Du die Hand, die Rückkehr bietend, offen hältst', while that of Singer is: 'O thou who openest thy hand to repentance'.

Emden sees in this phrase an allusion to the talmudic passage (Sanhedrin 103 a):

עשה לו הקב"ה' כמין מחתרת ברקיע כדי לקבלו בתשובה

and renders יד הפותח 'who openest a *place*' so as to correspond to the rabbinic idea that 'God created a special opening in heaven to receive the repentant' to whom the attribute of justice would deny admission.

But the interpretation would not suffer even if יד be given its ordinary meaning, with the phrasing altered to:

(b) הפותח יד | בתשובה לקבל פושעים וחטאים

'O thou who openest the hand, to receive transgressors and sinners in repentance.'

It is true that יד פתח usually conveys the idea of liberal bestowal rather than welcome receptivity; still a liturgical poet employs this term in this very sense when he sings in his Rosh-Hashanah piyut:

הפותח שער לרופקי בתשובה. וכל מאמינים שהוא פתוחה יד;

'He openeth his gate unto them that knock in repentance; And all believe that *his hand is ever open to receive them*' (Maḥzor Abodath Ohel Moed, 150).

21.

A similar solution of a textual difficulty, namely, the shifting of the pause, is suggested in connexion with the passage in the Sabbath Amidah (Singer, 139):

(a) והשבועי רצית בו וקדשתו | חמדת ימים אותו קראת זכר למעשה
בראשית

‘Thou didst find pleasure in the seventh day, and didst hallow it; thou didst call it the desirable of days, a remembrance of the creation.’

Where, it is generally asked, did God call the Sabbath ‘a desirable of days’? The standard answer to this question is well known. The word ויכל in Gen. 2. 2 is said to be rendered וחמיר by Targum Yerushalmi. But the famous Ḥazan R. Meir, the contemporary of Rashi, found a solution of his own in altering the phrasing thus: ¹⁴

(b) והשבועי רצית בו וקדשתו חמדת ימים | אותו קראת זכר למעשה
בראשית

‘Thou didst find pleasure in the seventh day and didst hallow it as a desirable of days; thou didst call it a remembrance of the creation.’

The solution is admittedly forced; but the original answer is hardly less so.

22.

Another obscure allusion to the Sabbath is disposed of in a very similar manner. Says the Kiddush (Singer, 124):

(a) כי הוא יום תחלה למקראי קדש | זכר ליציאת מצרים

‘For it is the first of the holy convocations, a remembrance of the departure from Egypt.’

Some commentators, indeed, make out a case for the Sabbath as a commemoration of the Exodus. But Moses ben Ma’hir, in סדר היום, suggests an altered phrasing of the text:

(b) כי הוא יום תחלה למקראי קדש זכר ליציאת מצרים

‘For it is the first of the holy convocations, *which are* a remembrance of the departure from Egypt.’

¹⁴ See Vitry 82; Tan. Rab., § 15.

The Festivals, the three rejoicing ones at all events, certainly answer to that designation better than does the Sabbath.

23.

To return to the Amidah—the prayer *ה' אלהינו רצה*, which is the nucleus of the Eighteen Benedictions, is one of the three blessings which accompanied the sacrificial offerings in the Temple. When these ceased, with its destruction, the prayer was not abolished—for who ever doubted its coming into use again with Israel's imminent restoration?—but adapted to the changed conditions. Among the modifications effected were the insertion of *והשב את העבודה לרביר ביתך* (which may have substituted the suggested original wording *ביתך* *והשב את העבודה לרביר ביתך*),¹⁵ and of the word *מהרה*—found both in Amram and Vitry—before *ברצון*. In this manner the prayer was not only shorn of its obsolete parts, but was turned to good account as an appropriate supplication for the restoration of the Temple ritual.

But then some French kabbalist stepped in, and made it a *sine qua non* that the prayer should only consist of thirty-four words *למלאות המספר הידוע ליודעי חן*. Some Ashkenazi congregations accordingly omitted *את* and others dropped *מהרה*. In the latter case an alteration in the phrasing was made to serve the purpose of the omitted word, namely to give it a prospective application.

Instead of

(a) *והשב את העבודה לרביר ביתך | ואשי ישראל ותפלתם (מהרה)*
באהבה תקבל ברצון

'Restore the service to the Sanctuary of thy house | and Israel's fire-offerings receive Thou in love and favour', they adopted

¹⁵ Rashi to Yoma 68 b, and to Ber. 11 b.

(*b*) והשב את העבודה לרביר ביתך ואשי ישראל | ותפלחם באהבה
תקבל ברצון.

‘Restore the service to the Sanctuary of thy house and Israel’s fire-offerings | and their prayers receive Thou in love and favour.’

The alteration is however unwarranted, and spoils the diction unnecessarily.¹⁶ Even without the מרה the words may well be taken to have a future application which, moreover, is suggested by והשב. That phrasing (*b*) is nevertheless so often heard is largely due to its being adopted, injudiciously, by the סדור כל-בו which is extensively used by Ḥazananim.

24.

A plausible remark is made by Berliner, *Randbem.*, I, 63, in reference to the next Benediction. The generally accepted phrasing

(*a*) . . . ועל נפלאותיך וטובותיך שבכל עת ערב ובקר וצהרים
he declares, is erroneous. There should be a break before ערב ובקר וצהרים since—analogous to אשיחה Ps. 55. 18—these words are not the extension of שבכל עת but of תהלתיך ונספר תהלתיך.

Thus:

(*b*) . . . ועל נפלאותיך וטובותיך שבכל עת—ערב ובקר וצהרים

Not,

‘We will give thanks unto Thee and declare thy praise for our lives . . . and for thy wonders and thy benefits which are wrought at all times, evening, morn and noon’ (Singer, 51).

But,

‘We will give thanks unto Thee and declare thy praise . . . evening, morn and noon.’

¹⁶ מ"ן to Or. Ḥayim, ch. 52; Landsuth’s statement that Seph. has the pause before ותפלחם is not borne out by reference to better editions.

25.

Another deviation from the generally accepted phrasing, in the same paragraph, is prescribed by Jacob Emden. Instead of

(a) כי לא תמו חסדיך | מעולם קיינו לך

he would have

(b) כי לא תמו חסדיך מעולם | קיינו לך

But Amram's wording ומעולם and Vitry's כי מעולם both point to the fact that מעולם should adjoin the following, not the preceding words.

26.

The ברכת כהנים (Singer, 53) has the following version in the modern Karaitic rite:

ברכנו בברכה המשלשת | הכתובה בתורתך | האמורה מפי אהרן ובניו
כהניך | ככתוב בתורתך

Our own version—identical both in Sephardi and Ashkenazi—which is not as clear, lends itself to the following alternative phrasing:

(a) ברכנו בברכה המשלשת | בתורה הכתובה על ידי משה עבדך . . .

(b) ברכנו בברכה המשלשת בתורה | הכתובה על ידי משה עבדך . . .

It is difficult to say which of these was favoured by our early authorities, since, as a rule, they do not mark these words by any division at all. Of modern liturgists, Baer (102) and Berliner (*Randbem.*, I, 62) prefer the former, while Sachs, as well as Singer, prefers—to judge by his translation—the latter. But neither is free from defects. Against (b) the objection is raised by Berliner that המשלשת בתורה can only mean 'the blessing *thrice mentioned* in the Law' instead of, what is evidently intended, 'threefold blessing'.¹⁷

¹⁷ Rabbi Avigdor Chaikin, Dayan of London, in a marginal note shown to the writer, actually interprets this phrase: 'Bless us with the Benediction *thrice mentioned* in thy Law'. For three times, indeed, the learned Dayan

But (a), which he commends, has certainly not less grave a fault. בתורה הכתובה presents a decidedly faulty diction. The words would have to be reversed if they are to mean 'which is written in the Law'. Singer, disregarding the phrasing he adopts in the Hebrew, steers a middle course in his English translation which he gives as :

'Bless us with the three-fold blessing of thy Law written by the hand of Moses thy servant, which was spoken by Aaron and his sons . . .'

But however smoothly this *rendering* may run, it can hardly be reconciled with the original. Moreover, if the words 'written by the hand of Moses thy servant' are to be regarded as qualifying the noun 'Law', as is here implied, then we are faced by the grammatical discrepancy of unrelated participles : התורה referring to תורה, and האמורה to ברכה. In Gaster's rendering (I, 36) :

'Bless us with that three-fold blessing mentioned in the Law, written by the hand of thy servant Moses, and which is to be pronounced . . .'

the latter difficulty is avoided apparently by making both participles refer to the 'blessing'. But the former difficulty remains. בתורה does not naturally mean '*mentioned* in the Law'.

Were it possible for the two words בתורה הכתובה to change places, as in the Karaite version, all objections would at once disappear, and we would get the perfect phrase

ברכנו בברכה המשלשת | הכתובה בתורה על ידי משה עבדך

asserts, does the priestly function of blessing the people occur in the Torah as an injunction, namely, Num. 6. 27 **וְכָה תְּבָרְכֶם אֶת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** ; Deut. 10. 8 **וּלְבָרֶךְ בְּשֵׁם ה'** 5 Deut. 21. 5 **וּלְבָרֶךְ בְּשֵׁם ה'**.

As it now stands, it seems best to follow neither (a) nor (b) but read the disputed part without a break, as it is put—perhaps not inadvertently—in early liturgies.

27.

In the first paragraph of the Ma'arib Service (Singer, 96) the phrasing of the following passage is now generally accepted:

(a) ומבריל בין יום ובין לילה ה' צבאות שמו | אל חי וקים
but it is as generally divergent in our earliest liturgies. Vitry has

(b) ומבריל בין יום ולילה | ה' צבאות שמו אל חי וקים
and this divergence is even more marked in Amram whose version is ה' צבאות שמו חי וקים.

28.

In the same paragraph, several Prayer Books, as well as *to Orah Hayim* 236, cite עמק ברכה ס' who emphasizes the break after כרצונו:

(a) . . . במשמרותיהם ברקיע כרצונו | בורא יום ולילה . . .
in contradistinction to what was apparently preferred by some,

(b) . . . במשמרותיהם ברקיע | כרצונו בורא יום ולילה . . .

29.

Is the familiar phrase תמיד לעולם ועד eligible? The answer can only be against employing this tautology. All that can be advanced in its favour is its occurrence in so many and various parts of the liturgy as (a) the Amidah:—ועל כלם . . . תמיד לעולם ועד; (b) Birkat Hamazon:—על הכל . . . תמיד; (c) Maphtir:—ועל הכל . . . תמיד לעולם ועד

לעולם ועד. But on tracing them to earlier sources we find all these supports tumble one by one. In the Amidah passage Amram has only לעולם ועד and Vitry has the two participles widely apart. So also in Birkat Hamazon Amram has לעולם ועד עלינו תמיד שמך תמיד ועד. While the earliest wording of the Maphtir passage, in Mas. Sopherim 13, 14, is: על הכל ה' אלהינו מורים לך ומברכים את שמך תמיד אלהי ישענו. ב' א' ' . . .

There is, therefore, but little doubt that originally some versions had only תמיד and others only לעולם ועד, and that our combination of the two is merely the result of fusing the different versions together, and like many another grammatical impropriety, has been made legitimate by common use.

Is there, however, any justification for employing it where it can be avoided? There can only be one answer; and this will help us to decide the following two disputed phrasings.

The one is in the first paragraph of the Evening Service :

(a) אל חי וקים תמיד | ימלך עלינו לעולם ועד

(b) אל חי וקים | תמיד ימלך עלינו לעולם ועד

Both in early and modern Prayer Books the phrase is marked by no division at all. It is, however, evident that Amram and Maḥzor Romi—both of which have הוא ימלך עלינו—adopted the former. Baer leaves it practically an open question, and Sachs, to judge by his translation, adopts the latter. Singer's rendering (96) 'a God living and enduring continually mayest Thou reign over us for ever and ever' is so equivocal that it is not easy to say which of the two he favours, but the more explicit rendering of the Maḥzor Abodath Ohel Moed (Davis-Adler) 'O God living and enduring continually, who wilt reign over us for ever and ever' obviously follows (a).

30.

The other example occurs in a later part of the same Service :

(a) המלך בכבודו תמיד | ימלך עלינו לעולם ועד

(b) המלך בכבודו | תמיד ימלך עלינו לעולם ועד

Baer, indeed, treats both this and the preceding as analogous. The analogy, however, breaks down on one important point. The common version of this passage contains a deviation from the original in the *reading*, which has a slight bearing on the phrasing. Amram, the Sephardi rites, and even Rokeah, all, consistently, adopt (a). But their reading is . . . המולך בכבודו תמיד.¹⁸ With our wording of המלך (b) would give a better sense. Still, as a commentator remarks, even המלך בכבודו תמיד is not a bad grouping when the biblical phrase of Ps. 24 הוא מלך הכבוד סלה is borne in mind.

Now, even if the evidence had been equal, we should have been justified, on the ground of orthography, in giving our casting vote in favour of separating תמיד from ועד לעולם in the last two instances ; as the evidence of early authorities is also preponderatingly on its side, there should be no question at all as to the preference of such phrasing.¹⁹

31.

It is evidently with a view to avoiding a similar tautology that Singer phrases the opening words of the dirge for the martyrs (155) :

(a) אב הרחמים שוכן מרומים ברחמיו העצומים | הוא יפקוד ברחמים . . .

¹⁸ Maimonides has : המולך בכבודו חי וקים תמיד ימלך עלינו :

¹⁹ Against the argument which may be advanced to the contrary, that usually appears as a fixed phrase without any participle, such instances as חי וקים לעולם (Mekilta Jetro 6) may be cited.

‘May the Father of mercies, who dwelleth on high in his mighty compassion, remember (mercifully) . . .’

though Baer prefers:

(*δ*) אב הרחמים שוכן מרומים | ברחמיו העצומים הוא יפקוד ברחמים . . .

‘May the Father of mercies who dwelleth on high, in his mighty compassion remember mercifully . . .’

Singer, however, is not alone in this divergency. He has Emden and Landshuth on his side.

32.

Dr. Berliner’s remark in regard to a similar phrase may here be cited :

The introduction to the ריבן (Singer’s new editions, 238 a) which is so often read as

(*a*) אנה רחום ברחמך הרבים | השב שכינתך . . .

is a misphrasing, and should be :

(*δ*) אנה רחום | ברחמך הרבים השב שכינתך . . .

33.

Pauses caused by interpolations, verbal and otherwise, are often the cause of irregular phrasings.

Thus the kissing of the ‘fringes’ each time the word *ציצית* is mentioned has inadvertently broken up the opening sentences of the third section of the Shema^a as follows :

(*a*) ועשו להם ציצית | על כנפי בגדיהם לדרתם ונתנו על ציצית |

פחיל תכלת :

instead of :

(*δ*) ועשו להם ציצית על כנפי בגדיהם לדרתם | ונתנו על ציצית הכנף

פחיל תכלת ; ^{19a}

^{19a} No wonder the Gaon of Wilna (רבי מעשה רב) is against the practice of kissing the *Zizit*.

34.

So also in the opening passage of the *Kaddish* (Singer, 75) the Amen response after רבא is obviously responsible for a misplaced break in consequence of which the general phrasing has become :

(a) יתגדל ויתקדש שמה רבא | בעלמא די ברא כרעותה וימליך מלכותה |

Now some commentators make כרעותה refer to רבא, 'which he *created according to his will*', while others—among whom is the Gaon of Wilna who cites in support the parallel passage (Singer, 145 sq.) . . . יתגדל ויתקדש . . . יתגדל ויתקדש—prefer to connect כרעותה with כרעותה—ברצונו . . . 'Magnified and sanctified . . . according to his will'. But in any case the phrase must close with it, viz. :

(a) יתגדל ויתקדש שמה רבא בעלמא די ברא כרעותה | וימליך מלכותה . . .

'Magnified and sanctified be his great name in the world which he created according to his will. May he establish his kingdom during your life and during your days . . .'

35.

The extent of the next Kaddish response is a matter of dispute. Maimonides and Ṭur (Or. H. 56) limit it to:

(a) ²⁰ יהא שמה רבא מברך לעלם ולעלמי עלמאי

Emden, who insists on this response, has even a 'כנור' to correspond numerically with its words. The Gaon of Wilna assumes that Amram includes also יתברך in the response, since he has אמן after יתברך.²¹ He therefore advocates the response

(b) יהא שמה רבא מברך לעלם ולעלמי עלמאי יתברך

²⁰ The Ḥazan continues with יתברך according to Maimonides ; according to Ṭur he is to repeat 'א. ש. ר. מ. ל. ג. ע'.

²¹ This is, however, no criterion ; for in Maimonides, where the response distinctly closes with עלמאי, there is also אמן after יתברך.

which is also favoured by מנן אברהם and is the Minhag Sephardi.

בית יוסף, however, followed by ש"ל'ה, extends the response to דאמירן בעלמא and states in Shulḥan Aruk (Or. H. 563)—where, strangely, it does not seem to extend beyond יתברך—that those who conclude it with עלמא are in error, as no הפסק is allowed between it and יתברך.²² That (b) is used in general practice contrary to the phrasing even of such commonly used Prayer Books as ררך החיים, not to mention the more critical ones, is perhaps accounted for by the fact that it is particularly favoured by choirs on account of the cadence supplied by יתברך, without which the musical rhythm would be greatly marred.

36.

Opinions are also divided on the point whether בריך הוא is to go with the preceding words:

(a) . . . שמה די קודשא בריך הוא | לעלא מן כל ברכתא

' . . . the name of the Holy One blessed be he | above all the blessings . . . '

or with the following:

(b) . . . שמה די קודשא | בריך הוא לעלא מן כל ברכתא

' . . . the name of the Holy One. Blessed be he above all the blessings . . . '

Those in favour of (a) include Saadya Gaon (cited by Abudraham) Maimonides—though only inferentially—and Minhag Sephardi.

Among those for (b) are אור זרוע who strongly opposes the other alternative, and רמ"א (Or. H. 56).

²² See Tan. Rabb., ch. 2. The author of ערך השלחן, Or. Hay., ch. 564, justly points out that this refers only to interruption by talking.

The acceptance of the one or the other of the alternatives would seem to depend largely on the point whether **ברוך הוא** is part of the text or merely a response. If the former, (a) would be more correct; if the latter, then (b). And the analogy employed by the Gaon of Wilna in another connexion, namely a comparison with the text of the prayer **על הכל** certainly points to the former, thus:

על הכל: וישתבח ויתפאר . . . שמו של . . . הקדוש ברוך הוא |
קריש: וישתבח ויתפאר . . . שמה די קדשא בריך הוא |

It may be noted that among modern liturgists Baer (130) is practically the only one who has a pause before **ברוך הוא**, which is also advocated by Berliner (*Randbem.*, I, 62). They were evidently both influenced by the opinion of **ר' ישעיה ברלין** whom the latter cites in this connexion.

37.

The **מנ"א** deprecates 'the practice of many *Hazanım*' who in intoning the following words of the Kaddish phrase it, evidently in order to meet the exigencies of the melody,

(a) לעלא מן כל | ברכתא ושירתא

instead of

(b) לעלא | מן כל ברכתא ושירתא

A misphrasing, far more commonly used, in the concluding passages of the prayer is:

(a) . . . וחיים עלינו | ועל כל ישראל. . . שלום עלינו | ועל כל ישראל

instead of

(b) . . . וחיים | עלינו ועל כל ישראל. . . שלום | עלינו ועל כל ישראל

38.

Polyphonic Rendering, or the alternate reading by Ḥazan and Congregation, has in the same way left its mark on the phrasing.

In some synagogues the custom has still survived of chanting the latter parts of the פסוקי דזמרה in alternate verses by the מוהל and the congregation on the occasion of a ברית. In some congregations this elaborate rendering commences with the suggestive sentence (Singer, 32) רוממות אל בנרונם 'High praises of God are in their throat, and a two-edged sword in their hand', more generally it begins with the even more appropriate verse (34) וברות עמו 'And thou madest a covenant with him'. The break thus made at this juncture has led to the beginning of a new paragraph with וברות—quite regardless of the fact that it forms the middle of a verse—whereby the biblical verse Neh. 9. 6:

(a) ומצאת את לבבו נאמן לפניך וברות עמו הברית . . .

is divided between two paragraphs:

(b) ומצאת את לבבו נאמן לפניך:

וברות עמו הברית . . .

Heidenheim, Sachs, and Landshuth have bridged the gap by entirely removing this division, while Baer, and accordingly Singer, merely omits the double-point after נאמן לפניך. But these are obviously of little avail while the practice still prevails of the Ḥazan concluding the paragraph with these words.

39.

R. Eliezer of Worms (Rokeah, § 320) records that his brother Hezekiah regarded with disfavour the practice of dividing the biblical verse of Ps. 148. 13:

(a) יהללו את שם ה' כי נשגב שמו לבדו הודו על ארץ ושמים :
 between Ḥazan and Congregation—as is still being done—
 on returning the Torah to the Ark (Singer, 70), as if the
 text were

Ḥazan— (b) יהללו את שם ה' כי נשגב שמו לבדו :
Congregation— הודו על ארץ ושמים

40.

And the only argument the Rokeaḥ could advance in
 defence of the practice is that it is not the only one of its
 kind. Is not Isa. 6. 3

(a) וקרא זה אל זה ואמר קדוש קדוש קדוש . . .
 rendered by Ḥazan and Congregation in the *kedushah* as if
 it were

(b) וקרא זה אל זה ואמר : קדוש קדוש קדוש : ²³

41.

Is not the biblical verse

(a) הודו לה' כי טוב כי לעולם חסדו
 divided at the circumcision ceremony (Singer, 305) by
 Mohel and Congregation, thus

Mohel— (b) הודו לה' כי טוב :
Congregation—²⁴ כי לעולם חסדו :

42.

There is, of course, also the example of Ps. 118. 24 :

(a) אנא ה' הושיעה נא אנא ה' הצליחה נא :
 being rendered in the Hallel (Singer, 223) as

(b) אנא ה' הושיעה נא :
Ḥazan and Congregation—
Ḥazan and Congregation— אנא ה' הצליחה נא :

²³ The division was less marked in the Rokeaḥ's time, when the con-
 gregation did not say נקרא to ואמר, but simply *joined* the Ḥazan at קדוש.

²⁴ Our custom is to repeat the *whole* verse after the Mohel.

43.

The appearance in all Prayer Books of a double אל ארך אפים (Singer, 65 sq.), the verbal difference between which is so slight, always seemed puzzling to liturgists, who, however, ascribed them to different *minhagim*, and even labelled them accordingly. In face of these the directions of Kol-Bo and Abudraham that *both* were to be said (which was upheld by Baer and followed by Singer) seemed anomalous.

This, however, is quite borne out by Vitry (71), according to whose text the theory that the two originated in different *minhagim* falls to the ground. Both, it is asserted, existed simultaneously—as they are indeed found—in each *minhag*.

‘The Ḥazan says’—

(a) אל ארך אפים . . . אל באפק תוכיחנו . . .

‘And the Congregation respond’—

(b) אל ארך אפים . . . אל חסתר פניך ממנו . . .

44.

Some Miscellaneous Examples may finally be mentioned.

In ברוך שאמר (Singer, 17), Emden and some Sephardic Prayer Books have

(a) משבח ומפאר בלשון חסידיו ועבדיו ובשירי דוד עבדך | נהללך
ה' אלהינו בשבחחות ובזמירות | נגדלך . . .

‘Lauded and glorified by the tongue of his loving ones and his servants and by the songs of David thy servant. We shall praise thee, O Lord our God, with praises and with psalms; we will magnify . . .’

instead of the generally accepted phrasing:

(b) משבח ומפאר בלשון חסידיו ועבדיו | ובשירי דוד עבדך נהללך
ה' אלהינו | בשבחחות ובזמירות נגדלך . . .

‘Lauded and magnified by the tongue of his loving ones and his servants. We will also praise thee, O Lord our God, with the songs of David thy servant; with praises and with psalms we will magnify . . .’

Either is eligible as far as the meaning goes. But syntactical evidence is in favour of (*ḥ*). The person changes from the third to the second with וּבְשִׁירֵי, which points to a break *before* that word.²⁵

45.

Another variation in the same prayer is:

(*a*) וּנְמַלִּיכְךָ מַלְכֵנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ | יְחִיד חַי הָעוֹלָמִים מֶלֶךְ . . .

(*ḥ*) וּנְמַלִּיכְךָ מַלְכֵנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְחִיד חַי הָעוֹלָמִים | מֶלֶךְ . . .

authoritative opinion being on the side of (*ḥ*).

46.

Vitry (148 sq.) refutes at some length the erroneous phrasing in נִשְׁמַח of

(*a*) וְרַבִּי רַבְבוֹת | פַּעֲמִים הַמּוֹבּוֹת . . .

which should, of course, be

(*ḥ*) וְרַבִּי רַבְבוֹת פַּעֲמִים | הַמּוֹבּוֹת . . .

47.

One cannot very well deviate from the biblical phrasing (Ps. 98. 3)

(*a*) זָכַר חֲסֵדוֹ וְאִמּוֹנָתוֹ לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל רְאוּ כָל אֲפָסֵי אֶרֶץ | אֶת יְשׁוּעַת
אֱלֹהֵינוּ:

in the קִבְּלַת שַׁבָּת. Yet the parallelism and sense point unmistakably to:

(*ḥ*) זָכַר חֲסֵדוֹ וְאִמּוֹנָתוֹ לְבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל | רְאוּ כָל אֲפָסֵי אֶרֶץ אֶת יְשׁוּעַת
אֱלֹהֵינוּ:

²⁵ רַבִּינוּ תָם, however, used in connexion with Hallel, the phrase: מִשְׁבַּח וּמְפֹאֵר בְּשִׁירֵי דֹד עַבְדְּךָ, Vitry, 192.

48.

In the concluding paragraph of the Hallel,

(a) יהללוך ה' אלהינו כל מעשיך | וחסידיך צדיקים . . .

is correct, not

(b) יהללוך ה' אלהינו כל מעשיך וחסידיך | צדיקים . . .

A number of other instances which are of less academic interest, though of considerable practical importance, must be held over for a popular treatise on the present subject which the writer has in preparation. A list of common errors in phrasing will likewise be more fittingly included there than in this article. The completion of this article has been unduly protracted as it is, owing to the closing of some sections of the British Museum on account of the War.

It may seem strange that the large majority of the variances quoted occur in one and the same *minhag*, where more harmony, if not absolute unanimity, might have been expected. Yet, considering that the earliest compilation of the Siddur, which properly consolidated the liturgy for the first time, was only made as late as the latter half of the ninth century, and that for some centuries afterwards the prayers continued to be read from memory by Ḥazanīm who exercised their licence to the full, the remarkable thing is that the divergencies are not far more numerous than they really are.

Still, would it be too much to expect that in the near future an authoritative council may do for the Siddur what the Masoretes have done for the more sacred Bible. The bringing into unison of the liturgical texts even of *each* of the two parent rites—the Ashkenazi and Sephardi—would greatly improve the shape of one of the greatest monuments of the Hebrew genius, and be a good step towards repairing the breaches in the House of Israel.